

January 9, 2006

Response to the Office Action mailed on or about September 7, 2005

Amendments to the Drawings:

An attached sheet of drawings includes changes to FIG. 1 and FIG. 2. This sheet, which includes FIG. 1 and FIG. 2, replaces the original sheet including FIG. 1 and FIG. 2. In FIG. 1 and FIG. 2, the previously blank boxes have been labeled pursuant to the Examiner's admonition.

An attached sheet of drawings includes changes to FIG. 3. This sheet, which includes FIG. 3, replaces the previously filed replacement sheet including FIG. 3. In FIG. 3, the previously blank box has been labeled pursuant to the Examiner's admonition.

An attached sheet of drawings includes changes to FIG. 4 and FIG. 5. This sheet, which includes FIG. 4 and FIG. 5, replaces the previously filed replacement sheet including FIG. 4 and FIG. 5. In FIG. 4 and FIG. 5, the previously blank boxes have been labeled pursuant to the Examiner's admonition.

No amendments to any of FIGs. 6-8 are presented at this time.

Attachments:	Replacement Sheet showing FIG. 1 and FIG. 2
	Replacement Sheet showing FIG. 3
	Replacement Sheet showing FIG. 4 and FIG. 5

January 9, 2006

Response to the Office Action mailed on or about September 7, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS***Claim Objections***

The Examiner objected to claim 24, asserting that “the recitation ‘the switching frequency’” lacked antecedent basis. Claim 24 has been amended to replace “the switching frequency” with “a switching frequency.” Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the objection to claim 24 has been traversed.

The Examiner also objected to claims 4-28 as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but acknowledged that claims 4-28 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 5, 6, 10, 22, and 23 have been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims; claims 7-8, 11-21, and 24-28 depend from one or more of the presently independent claims 5, 6, 10, 22, and 23; and claims 4 and 9 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the objection to claims 4-28 has been traversed.

Drawings

The Examiner objected to the drawings, asserting that “labels for the blank boxes in figures 1-5 [were] missing.” In FIG. 1, FIG. 2, FIG. 3, FIG. 4, and FIG. 5, the previously blank boxes have been labeled pursuant to the Examiner’s admonition. The added labels are all consistent with the written description. No new matter has been

January 9, 2006

Response to the Office Action mailed on or about September 7, 2005

added. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the drawing objections have been traversed.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,480,067 to Kobayashi ("Kobayashi") and the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,677,962 to Harrison et al. ("Harrison"). Claims 1-3 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) have been mooted.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner acknowledged that claims 4-28 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and the Examiner has acknowledged that claims 29 and 30 are directed to allowable subject matter. Claims 5, 6, 10, 22, and 23 have been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims; claims 7-8, 11-21, and 24-28 depend from one or more of the presently independent claims 5, 6, 10, 22, and 23; and claims 4 and 9 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 5-8 and 10-30 are in condition for allowance.

January 9, 2006

Response to the Office Action mailed on or about September 7, 2005

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests entry of the foregoing amendments, consideration of the foregoing remarks, and issuance of a timely Notice of Allowance in this case. Please charge any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-0014, but not to include any payment of issue fees.

Respectfully submitted,

MAGINOT, MOORE & BECK LLP



January 9, 2006

Gerald W. Roberts
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 45,046
Chase Tower
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3250
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-5115
(317)-638-2922 phone
(317)-638-2139 fax

Attachments (as indicated above)